arXiv:1701.08185v1 [math.ST] 27 Jan 2017

MULTILEVEL MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATION WITH APPLICATION TO COVARIANCE MATRICES

Marie Turčičová* Jan Mandel† Kryštof Eben‡

* Institute of Computer Science, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Pod Vodárenskou věží 271/2, 182 07 Praha 8, Czech Republic, and
Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics
Sokolovská 83, Prague 8, 186 75, Czech republic
turcicova@cs.cas.cz

† University of Colorado Denver, Denver, CO 80217-3364, USA, and
Institute of Computer Science, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Pod Vodárenskou věží 271/2, 182 07 Praha 8, Czech Republic
Jan.Mandel@ucdenver.edu

‡ Institute of Computer Science, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Pod Vodárenskou věží 271/2, 182 07 Praha 8, Czech Republic
eben@cs.cas.cz

Key Words: maximum likelihood; nested parameter spaces; Fisher information; high dimension.

ABSTRACT

The asymptotic variance of a maximum likelihood estimate is proved to decrease by restricting the maximization to a subspace that is known to contain the true parameter. Covariance matrices of many random fields are known to be diagonal or approximately diagonal in a suitable basis. Such sample covariance matrices were improved by omitting off-diagonal terms. Maximum likelihood estimation on subspaces of diagonal matrices allows a systematic fitting of diagonal covariance models including parameterizations of eigenvalue decay by a small number of parameters, which can reduce the sampling noise in high dimension substantially. The performance of the estimators is illustrated computationally.

1 INTRODUCTION

Estimation of large covariance matrices from small samples is an important problem in many fields, including spatial statistics, genomics, and ensemble filtering. One of the prominent applications is data assimilation in meteorology and oceanography, where the dimension of state vector describing the atmosphere or ocean is in order of millions or larger. Every practically available sample is a small sample in this context, since a reasonable approximation of the full covariance can be obtained only with sample size of the order of the dimension of the problem (Vershynin, 2012). In practice, the sample covariance[1] is singular and polluted by spurious correlations. Nevertheless, it

[1]In this paper, by sample covariance we mean the maximum likelihood estimate of covariance matrix using the norming constant N as opposed to the unbiased estimate with norming constant $(N-1)$.

bears a useful information (e.g. on covariances present in the actual atmospheric flow) and different techniques can be applied in order to improve the covariance model and its practical performance.

One common technique is shrinkage, that is, a linear combination of sample covariance and a positive definite target matrix, which embodies some information about the covariance. The target matrix can be, e.g., unit diagonal or, more generally, positive diagonal (Ledoit and Wolf, 2004); see Schäfer and Strimmer (2005) for a survey of such shrinkage approaches. Shrinkage of sample covariance towards a fixed covariance matrix based on a specific model and estimated from historical data (usually called background covariance) is being used successfully in meteorology (Hamill and Snyder, 2000; Wang et al., 2008). This approach is justified as one which combines flow-dependent and climatologic information on spatial covariances present in the 3D meteorological fields.

Another approach to modifying sample covariance matrix is by localization, suppressing long-range spurious correlations, commonly done by multiplying the sample covariance term by term by a gradual cutoff matrix (Buehner and Charron, 2007; Furrer and Bengtsson, 2007). This procedure is particularly advantageous in the spectral domain, as the covariance of a random field in Fourier space is diagonal if and only if a random field in cartesian geometry is second order stationary, i.e., the covariance between the values at two points depends only on their distance vector. Alternatively, we may assume diagonal covariance in a wavelet basis, which provides spatial variability as well (Pannekoucke et al., 2007). Spectral diagonal covariance models were successfully used in operational statistical interpolation in meteorology (Parrish and Derber, 1992).

Sparse approximations of covariance matrices are a good compromise between realistic assumptions and cheap computations, and versions of Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF) were developed which construct diagonal covariance in Fourier or wavelet space in every update step of the filter at low cost and can operate with small ensembles (Mandel et al., 2010; Beezley et al., 2011; Kasanický et al., 2015). By improving a sparse approximation of the covariance matrix that will be closer to reality, one can carry out the data assimilation successfully even with a small ensemble. Therefore, different covariance models and their error estimates are of great interest.

In this paper, we use the theory of maximum likelihood estimation to prove that for any two nested subspaces of the parametric space containing the true parameter, the asymptotic covariance matrices of the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE) are ordered accordingly. In other words, by confining us to a smaller subspace we can only improve the estimator. These results hold for a general parameter and in the special case of MLE for covariance matrices we do not need any invertibility assumption.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, we provide a brief statement of MLE and its asymptotic variance. The properties of MLE on a nested hierarchy of parametric spaces is studied in Sect. 3. The application to estimation of covariance matrices is presented in Sect. 4, and Sect. 5 contains a computational illustration. A discussion of the suitability of the hierarchical model and statistical tests, which can determine if a smaller space of parameters is appropriate, is in Sect. 6.

2 ASYMPTOTIC VARIANCE OF THE MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATOR

First, we briefly review some standard results for reference. Suppose $\mathbb{X}_N = [\boldsymbol{X}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}_N]$ is a random sample from a distribution on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with density $f(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with unknown parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in a parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$. The maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_N$ of the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$ is

defined by maximizing the likelihood

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_N = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X}_N\right), \quad \mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X}_N\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{X}_i\right), \quad \mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{x}\right) = f\left(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}\right),$$

or, equivalently, maximizing the log likelihood

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_N = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X}_N\right), \quad \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X}_N\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{X}_i\right), \quad \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{x}\right) = \log f\left(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}\right). \tag{1}$$

Let us adopt the usual assumptions that (i) the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$ lies in the interior of Θ, (ii) the density f determines the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ uniquely in the sense that $f(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = f(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ a.e. if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_2$, and (iii) $f\left(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}\right)$ is a sufficiently smooth function of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$**.** Then the error of the estimate is asymptotically normal,

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_N - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0}), \text{ as } N \to \infty, \tag{2}$$

where

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0} = J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0}^{-1}, \quad J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0} = \mathrm{E}\left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0|\boldsymbol{X})^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0|\boldsymbol{X})\right), \quad \boldsymbol{X} \sim f\left(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}^0\right). \tag{3}$$

The matrix $J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0}$ is called the Fisher information matrix for the parameterization $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$. Here, $\boldsymbol{X}$, $\boldsymbol{x}$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are columns, while the gradient $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\ell$ of ℓ with respect to the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a row vector, which is compatible with the dimensioning of Jacobi matrices below. The mean value in (3) is taken with respect to $\boldsymbol{X}$, which is the only random quantity in (3). Cf., e.g., (Lehmann and Casella, 1998, Theorem 5.1) for details.

3 NESTED MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATORS

Now suppose that we have an additional information that the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$ lies in a subspace of Θ, which is parameterized by $k \le p$ parameters $(\varphi_1,\ldots.\varphi_k)^\top = \boldsymbol{\varphi}$. Denote by $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$ the $p \times k$ Jacobi matrix with entries $\frac{\partial\theta_i}{\partial\varphi_j}$. In the next theorem, we derive the asymptotic covariance of the maximum likelihood estimator for $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_N = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\mathbb{X}_N\right), \quad \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\mathbb{X}_N\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\boldsymbol{X}_i\right), \quad \ell\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\boldsymbol{x}\right) = \log f\left(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}\right)\right), \tag{4}$$

based on the asymptotic covariance of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in (2).

Theorem 1 *Assume that the map $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$ is one-to-one from $\Phi \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ to Θ, the map $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$ is continuously differentiable, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$ is full rank for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \Phi$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)$ with $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0$ in the interior of Φ. Then,*

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_N - \boldsymbol{\varphi}^0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_k\left(\mathbf{0}, Q_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0}\right) \text{ as } N \to \infty, \tag{5}$$

where $Q_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0} = J_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0}^{-1}$, with $J_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0}$ the Fisher information matrix of the parameterization $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ given by

$$J_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0} = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)^\top J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0). \tag{6}$$

Proof. From (3) and the chain rule

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\boldsymbol{X}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{X}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0} &= \mathrm{E}\left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0|\boldsymbol{X})^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0|\boldsymbol{X}) \right) \\ &= \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)^\top \mathrm{E}\left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0|\boldsymbol{X})^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0|\boldsymbol{X}) \right) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0) \\ &= \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)^\top J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0). \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic distribution (5) is now (2) applied to $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$. ■

When the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the quantity of interest in an application, it is useful to express the estimate and its variance in terms of the original parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ rather than the subspace parameter $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$.

Corollary 2 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\sqrt{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_N\right) - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_p\left(\mathbf{0}, Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)}\right) \text{ as } N \to \infty, \tag{7}$$

where

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)} = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0) J_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0}^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)^\top = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0) \left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)^\top J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0}^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)^\top. \tag{8}$$

Proof. The lemma follows from (5) by the delta method (Rao, 1973, p. 387), since the map $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$ is continuously differentiable. ■

Remark 3 *The matrix $Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)}$ is singular, so it cannot be written as the inverse of another matrix, but it can be understood as the inverse $J^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)}$ of the Fisher information matrix for $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$, embedded in the larger parameter space Θ.*

Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is another parameterization which satisfies the same assumption as $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ in Theorem 1: the map $\boldsymbol{\psi} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is one-to-one from $\Psi \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \leq p$, to Θ, $\boldsymbol{\psi} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is continuously differentiable, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is full rank for all $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Psi$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)$, where $\boldsymbol{\psi}^0$ is in the interior of Ψ. Then, similarly as in (7), we have also

$$\sqrt{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_N) - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_p\left(\mathbf{0}, Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)}\right) \text{ as } N \to \infty, \tag{9}$$

where, as in (8),

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)} = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0) J_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^0}^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)^\top = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0) \left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)^\top J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0}^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)^\top. \tag{10}$$

The next theorem shows that when we have two parameterizations $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ which are nested, then the smaller parameterization has smaller or equal asymptotic covariance than the larger one. For symmetric matrices A and B, $A \leq B$ means that $A - B$ is positive semidefinite.

Theorem 4 *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1, and there exists a differentiable mapping $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\psi}$ from Φ to Ψ, such that $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0 \mapsto \boldsymbol{\psi}^0$. Then,*

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)} \leq Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)}. \tag{11}$$

In addition, if $U \sim \mathcal{N}_p\left(\mathbf{0}, Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)}\right)$ *and* $V \sim \mathcal{N}_p\left(\mathbf{0}, Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)}\right)$ *are random vectors with the asymptotic distributions of the estimates* $\boldsymbol{\theta}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_N\right)$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\theta}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_N\right)$*, then*

$$\mathrm{E}\,|U|^2 = \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)} \leq \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)} = \mathrm{E}\,|V|^2\,, \tag{12}$$

where $|V| = \left(V^\top V\right)^{1/2}$ *is the standard Euclidean norm in* $\mathbb{R}^p$*.*

Proof. Denote $A = J_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^0}$, $B = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0)$, $C = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0)$. From the chain rule,

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0\right) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^0\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\psi}\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0\right),$$

we have that $B = C\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\boldsymbol{\psi}\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^0\right)$, and, consequently, $\mathrm{Range}\,B \subset \mathrm{Range}\,C$. Define

$$P_B = A^{1/2}B(B^\top AB)^{-1}B^\top A^{1/2},$$
$$P_C = A^{1/2}C(C^\top AC)^{-1}C^\top A^{1/2}.$$

The matrices P_B and P_C are symmetric and idempotent, hence they are orthogonal projections. In addition,

$$\mathrm{Range}\,P_B = \mathrm{Range}\,A^{1/2}B \subset \mathrm{Range}\,A^{1/2}C = \mathrm{Range}\,P_C.$$

Consequently, $P_B \leq P_C$ holds from standard properties of orthogonal projections, and (11) follows.

To prove (12), note that for random vector X with $\mathrm{E}\,X = 0$ and finite second moment, $\mathrm{E}\,|X|^2 = \mathrm{Tr}\,\mathrm{Cov}\,X$ from Karhunen-Loève decomposition and Parseval identity. The proof is concluded by using the fact that for symmetric matrices, $A \leq B$ implies $\mathrm{Tr}\,A \leq \mathrm{Tr}\,B$, cf., e.g., Carlen (2010). ■

Remark 5 *In the practically interesting cases when there is a large difference in the dimensions of the parameters* $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\psi}$*, many eigenvalues in the covariance of the estimation error become zero. The computational tests in Sec. 5 show that the resulting decrease of the estimation error can be significant.*

4 APPLICATION: NESTED COVARIANCE MODELS

The model of covariance (e.g. of the state vector in a numerical weather prediction model) and the quality of estimated covariance form one of the key components of data assimilation algorithms. The dimension of the problem usually prohibits working with the covariance matrix in a straightforward manner. In ensemble filtering methods, this difficulty may be circumvented by working directly with the original small sample like in the classical Ensemble Kalman filter. This, however, effectively means using the sample covariance matrix with its rank deficiency and spurious correlations. Other filtering methods use shrinkage and localization as stated above and ad hoc techniques of reduction of the dimension.

On the other hand, variational assimilation methods, which dominate today's practice of meteorological services, usually employ a covariance model based on a series of transformations leading to independence of variables (Bannister, 2008; Michel and Auligné, 2010). At the end this results in an estimation problem for normal distribution with a diagonal covariance matrix.

For both ensemble and variational methods, any additional knowledge can be used to improve the estimate of covariance, like second-order stationarity leading to diagonality in spectral space or diagonality in wavelet space (e.g., Pannekoucke et al., 2007).

We thus come to the estimation problem (with the usual normality assumption)

$$\boldsymbol{X} \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, D), \tag{13}$$

where $\boldsymbol{X}$ denotes the random field after the appropriate transform and D is a diagonal matrix. It is clear that estimating D by the full sample covariance matrix (what would be the case when using the classical EnKF) is ineffective in this situation and it is natural to use only the diagonal part of the sample covariance. In practice, the resulting diagonal matrix may still turn out to be noisy (Kasanický et al., 2015), and further assumptions like a certain type of decay of the diagonal entries may be realistic.

In what follows we state some known facts on full and diagonal covariance, propose parametric models for the diagonal and compute corresponding MLE.

4.1 Sample covariance

The top-level parameter space Θ consists of all symmetric positive definite matrices, resulting in the parameterization Σ with $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ independent parameters. The likelihood of a sample $\mathbb{X}_N = \left[\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)}\right]$ from $\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ is

$$L\left(\Sigma|\mathbb{X}_N\right) = \frac{1}{\left(\det \Sigma\right)^{N/2} \left(2\pi\right)^{nN/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\Sigma^{-1}\mathbb{X}_N\mathbb{X}_N^{\mathrm{T}}\right)}.$$

If $N \geq n$, it is well known (e.g. Muirhead (2005), p. 83) that the likelihood is maximized at what we call here sample covariance matrix

$$\hat{\Sigma}_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(i)} \left(\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\right)^{\top}. \tag{14}$$

The Fisher information matrix of the sample covariance estimator is (Magnus and Neudecker, 2007, p. 356)

$$J^{(0)}(\operatorname{vec}(\Sigma)) = \frac{1}{2}\Sigma^{-1} \otimes \Sigma^{-1},$$

where $\otimes$ stands for the Kronecker product and vec is an operator that transforms a matrix into a vector by stacking the columns of the matrix one underneath the other. This matrix has dimension $n^2 \times n^2$.

Remark 6 *If $\hat{\Sigma}_N$ is singular, $L\left(\hat{\Sigma}_N|\mathbb{X}_N\right)$ cannot be evaluated because that requires the inverse of $\hat{\Sigma}$. Also, in this case the likelihood $L\left(\Sigma|\mathbb{X}_N\right)$ is not bounded above on the set of all $\Sigma > 0$, thus the maximum of $L\left(\Sigma|\mathbb{X}_N\right)$ does not exist on that space. To show that, consider an orthonormal change of basis so that the vectors in $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbb{X}_N\right)$ come first, write vectors and matrices in the corresponding 2×2 block form, and let*

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_N = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Sigma}_{11} > 0.$$

Then $\lim_{a\to 0^+} \mathbb{X}_N^{\top}\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_N + aI\right)^{-1}\mathbb{X}_N$ exists, but $\lim_{a\to 0^+} \det\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_N + aI\right) = 0$, thus

$$\lim_{a\to 0^+} L\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_N + aI \middle| \mathbb{X}_N\right) = \infty.$$

Note that when the likelihood is redefined in terms of the subspace $\operatorname{span}\left(\mathbb{X}_N\right)$ only, the sample covariance can be obtained by maximization on the subspace (Rao, 1973, p. 527).

When the true covariance is diagonal, cf. (13), a significant improvement can be achieved by setting the off-diagonal terms of sample covariance to zero,

$$\hat{D}_N^{(0)} = \operatorname{diag}\left(\hat{\Sigma}_N\right). \tag{15}$$

It is known that using only the diagonal of the unbiased sample covariance

$$\hat{\Sigma}_N^u = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\left(\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\right)^\top$$

results in smaller (or equal) Frobenius norm of the error pointwise,

$$\left|\hat{D}_N^{(0)} - D\right|_F \leq \left|\hat{\Sigma}^u]_N - D\right|_F \tag{16}$$

cf., Furrer and Bengtsson (2007) for the case when the mean is assumed to be known like here, and Kasanický et al. (2015) for the unbiased sample covariance and unknown mean.

4.2 Diagonal covariance

The next parameter space Θ_1 consists of all diagonal matrices with positive diagonal, with n parameters $\boldsymbol{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)^\top$. The log-likelihood function for $D = \operatorname{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ with a given random sample $\mathbb{X}_N = \left[\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)}\right]$ from $N_n(0, D)$ is

$$\ell(D|\mathbb{X}_N) = -\frac{N}{2}\log\left((2\pi)^n|D|\right) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\boldsymbol{X}^{(k)}\right)^\top D^{-1}\boldsymbol{X}^{(k)}$$

and has its maximum at

$$\hat{d}_j = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(X_j^{(k)}\right)^2, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{17}$$

where $X_j^{(k)}$ denotes the j-th entry of $\boldsymbol{X}^{(k)}$. The sum of squares $S_j^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(X_j^{(k)}\right)^2$ is a sufficient statistic for the variance d_j. Thus, we get the maximum likelihood estimator

$$\hat{D}_N^{(1)} = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{diag}\left(S_1^2, \ldots, S_n^2\right). \tag{18}$$

It is easy to compute the Fisher information matrix explicitly,

$$J_{D^{(1)}} = \operatorname{diag}\left(\frac{1}{2d_1^2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2d_n^2}\right). \tag{19}$$

which is an $n \times n$ matrix and gives the asymptotic covariance of the estimation error

$$\frac{1}{N}Q_{D^{(1)}} = \frac{1}{N}J_{D^{(1)}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{diag}\left(2d_1^2, \ldots, 2d_n^2\right)$$

from (2).

4.3 Diagonal covariance with prescribed decay by 3 parameters

A more specific situation appears when we have an additional information that the matrix D is not only diagonal, but its diagonal entries have a prescribed decay. For instance, this decay can be governed by a model of the form $d_i = ((c_1 + c_2 h_i) f_i(\alpha))^{-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where c_1, c_2 and α are unknown parameters, $h_1, \dots, h_n$ are known positive numbers, and $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are known differentiable functions. For easier computation it is useful to work with $\tau_i = \frac{1}{d_i} = (c_1 + c_2 h_i) f_i(\alpha)$. Maximum likelihood estimators for c_1, c_2, and α can be computed effectively from the likelihood

$$\ell(D|\mathbb{X}_N) = -\frac{N}{2} n \log(2\pi) + \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \tau_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_i S_i^2 \tag{20}$$

by using the chain rule. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial c_1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \tau_i} \frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial c_1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{N}{2\tau_i} - \frac{S_i^2}{2} \right) \frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial c_1} \\ &= \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{(c_1 + c_2 h_i) f_i(\alpha)} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 \right) f_i(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Setting this derivative equal to zero we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{c_1 + c_2 h_i} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 f_i(\alpha) \right) = 0. \tag{21}$$

Analogously,

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial c_2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \tau_i} \frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial c_2} = \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{(c_1 + c_2 h_i) f_i(\alpha)} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 \right) h_i f_i(\alpha),$$

so the equation for estimating the parameter c_2 is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{h_i}{c_1 + c_2 h_i} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 h_i f_i(\alpha) \right) = 0. \tag{22}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \tau_i} \frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{(c_1 + c_2 h_i) f_i(\alpha)} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 \right) (c_1 + c_2 h_i) \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \\ &= \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{f_i(\alpha)} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 (c_1 + c_2 h_i) \right) \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \end{aligned}$$

and setting the derivative to zero, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} - \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 (c_1 + c_2 h_i) \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right) = 0. \tag{23}$$

The maximum likelihood estimator for D is then given by

$$\hat{D}_3 = \operatorname{diag}\{((\hat{c}_1 + \hat{c}_2 h_i) f_i(\hat{\alpha}))^{-1}, i = 1, \dots, n\}, \tag{24}$$

where $(\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2, \hat{\alpha})$ is the solution of the system (21), (22), (23). This expression corresponds to searching a maximum likelihood estimator of D in the subspace $\Theta_3 \subset \Theta_1 \subset \Theta$ formed by diagonal matrices $\mathrm{diag}\{((c_1 + c_2 h_i) f_i(\alpha))^{-1}, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$.

For completeness, the asymptotic covariance of the estimation error about

$$D = \mathrm{diag}\{d_i(c_1, c_2, \alpha), i = 1, \ldots, n\},$$

contained in $\mathbb{X}_N$ is

$$\frac{1}{N} Q_{D^{(3)}} = \frac{1}{N} \nabla \boldsymbol{d}(c_1, c_2, \alpha) J^{-1}_{c_1, c_2, \alpha} \nabla \boldsymbol{d}(c_1, c_2, \alpha)^\top \tag{25}$$

from (8), where the Fisher information matrix $J_{c_1,c_2,\alpha}$ is the 3×3 matrix

$$J_{c_1,c_2,\alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(c_1+c_2h_i)^2} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{h_i}{(c_1+c_2h_i)^2} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(c_1+c_2h_i)f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \\ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{h_i}{(c_1+c_2h_i)^2} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{h_i^2}{(c_1+c_2h_i)^2} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{h_i}{(c_1+c_2h_i)f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \\ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(c_1+c_2h_i)f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{h_i}{(c_1+c_2h_i)f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{f_i^2(\alpha)} \left(\frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha}\right)^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{d}(c_1, c_2, \alpha) &= [d_1(c_1, c_2, \alpha), \ldots, d_n(c_1, c_2, \alpha)]^\top \\ &= \left[((c_1 + c_2 h_1) f_1(\alpha))^{-1}, \ldots, ((c_1 + c_2 h_n) f_n(\alpha))^{-1}\right]^\top. \end{aligned}$$

4.4 Diagonal covariance with prescribed decay by 2 parameters

We may consider a more specific model for diagonal elements with two parameters: $d_i = (c f_i(\alpha))^{-1}$, i.e. $\tau_i = c f_i(\alpha)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, where c and α are unknown parameters. Maximum likelihood estimators for c and α can be computed similarly as in the previous case. The estimating equations have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 f_i(\alpha) \\ \frac{1}{c} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be rearranged to

$$\frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{N} S_i^2 f_i(\alpha) \tag{26}$$

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^n S_i^2 f_i(\alpha) \left(\frac{1}{f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{f_j(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_j(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right). \tag{27}$$

Equation (27) is an implicit formula for estimating α. Its result can be used for estimating c through (26). The maximum likelihood estimator for D is then given by

$$\hat{D}_2 = \mathrm{diag}\left((\hat{c} f_1(\hat{\alpha}))^{-1}, \ldots, (\hat{c} f_n(\hat{\alpha}))^{-1}\right), \tag{28}$$

where $\hat{c}$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ are MLEs of c and α. It corresponds to searching a maximum likelihood estimator of D in the subspace $\Theta_2 \subset \Theta_3 \subset \Theta_1 \subset \Theta$ formed by diagonal matrices $\mathrm{diag}\{(cf_i(\alpha))^{-1}, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Of course, the estimator $\hat{D}_2$ does not have "larger" variance than $\hat{D}_3$.

The covariance of the asymptotic distribution of the parameters $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ is

$$\frac{1}{N} Q_{D^{(2)}} = \frac{1}{N} \nabla \boldsymbol{d}(c, \alpha) J_{c,\alpha}^{-1} \nabla \boldsymbol{d}(c, \alpha)^\top, \tag{29}$$

from (8), where Fisher information matrix at $D = \mathrm{diag}\{d_i(c, \alpha), i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ is the 2×2 matrix

$$J_{c,\alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{n}{2c^2} & \frac{1}{2c} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \\ \frac{1}{2c} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f_i(\alpha)} \frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f_i^2(\alpha)} \left(\frac{\partial f_i(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right)^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\boldsymbol{d}(c, \alpha) = [d_1(c, \alpha), \ldots, d_n(c, \alpha)]^\top = \left[(cf_1(\alpha))^{-1}, \ldots, (cf_n(\alpha))^{-1} \right]^\top$.

5 SIMULATION STUDY

In Section 3, we have shown that in the sense of asymptotic variance and second moment (mean-squared) error, the maximum likelihood estimator computed in a smaller subspace containing the true parameter is more (or equally) precise. For small samples we illustrate this behavior by means of a simulation. The simulation was carried out as follows. First, the diagonal matrix D was prepared, whose diagonal entries decay according to the model $d_i = \frac{1}{c} e^{\alpha \lambda_i}, i = 1, \ldots, n$, where c and α are parameters and λ_i are the eigenvalues of Laplace operator in two dimensions on 10×10 nodes, resulting in $n = 100$. Such models are useful in modeling smooth random fields, e.g., in meteorology. Then, random samples were generated from $\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, D)$ with sample sizes $N = 5, \ldots, 20$. For each sample, four covariance matrix estimators were computed:

- sample covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_N$, cf., (14)
- diagonal part $\hat{D}^{(0)}$ of the sample covariance matrix, cf. (15)
- MLE $\hat{D}^{(1)}$ in the space of diagonal matrices, cf., (18)
- MLE $\hat{D}^{(3)} = \mathrm{diag}\{(\hat{c}_1 - \hat{c}_2 \lambda_i)^{-1} e^{\hat{\alpha} \lambda_i}, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ with 3 parameters c_1, c_2 and α, cf., (24).
- MLE $\hat{D}^{(2)} = \mathrm{diag}\{\hat{c}^{-1} e^{\hat{\alpha} \lambda_i}, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ with 2 parameters c and α, cf., (28).

Let us briefly discuss the choice of the covariance model $d_i = \frac{1}{c} e^{\alpha \lambda_i}$. We decided to carry out the simulation with a second-order stationary random field, whose covariance can be diagonalized by the Fourier transform. This transform is formed by the eigenvectors of the Laplace operator. Hence, it is reasonable to model the diagonal terms of this covariance matrix (i.e. the covariance eigenvalues) by some function of eigenvalues of the Laplace operator. This function needs to have a sufficiently fast decay in order to fulfil the necessary condition for the proper covariance (the so-called trace class property, e.g., Kuo (1975)). The exponential decay is used, e.g., in Mirouze and Weaver (2010). Another possible choice of a covariance model is a power model, where the eigenvalues of the covariance are assumed to be a negative power of $-\lambda_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$, e.g., Berner et al. (2009); Gaspari et al. (2006); Simpson et al. (2012).

The difference of each estimator from the true matrix D was measured in the Frobenius norm, which is the same as the Euclidean norm of a matrix written as one long vector. In order to reduce



Figure 1: Comparison of the error matrix $\hat{D} - D$ in the Frobenius norm. The field had dimension $n = 10 \times 10$. Exponential decay of eigenvalues (i.e. $\tau_i = ce^{\alpha\lambda_i}, i = 1, \ldots, n$) was used with parameters $c = 1/30$ and $\alpha = 0.002$. The full line is the order of convergence const(N^{-1}) fitted to the error of the sample covariance.

the sampling error, 50 simulations of the same size were generated and the mean Frobenius norm squared was computed. The results can be found in Fig. 1.

For the diagonal MLE, given by (18), (24), and (28), we can expect from (12) that these estimators should satisfy asymptotically

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\left|\hat{D}_N^{(k)} - D\right|_F^2\right) \approx \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{Tr}(J_{D^{(k)}}^{-1}), \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \tag{30}$$

even if convergence in distribution does not imply convergence of moments without additional assumptions. This conjecture can be supported by a comparison of Figures 3 and 2, where we observe the same decay. From the nesting, we know that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(J_{D^{(2)}}^{-1}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(J_{D^{(3)}}^{-1}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(J_{D^{(1)}}^{-1}) \tag{31}$$

and we can expect that the Frobenius norm should decrease for more restrictive models, that is,

$$\mathrm{E}\left|\hat{D}_N^{(2)} - D\right|_F^2 \leq \mathrm{E}\left|\hat{D}_N^{(3)} - D\right|_F^2 \leq \mathrm{E}\left|\hat{D}_N^{(1)} - D\right|_F^2, \tag{32}$$

which is confirmed by the simulations (see Figure 2, resp. 3).

The comparisons (32) of the Frobenius norm of the error in the mean squared complement the pointwise comparison (16) between the sample covariance and its diagonal. Relying on MLE for that comparison is not practical, because the sample size of interest here is $N < n$, and, consequently, $\hat{\Sigma}_N$ is singular and cannot be cast as MLE with an accompanying Fisher information matrix, cf. Remark 6. But it is evident that for small sample sizes, estimators computed in the proper subspace perform better. Hence, the hierarchical order seems to hold even when $N < n$.



Figure 2: $\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}(J_D^{-1})$ for the three parameterizations.



Figure 3: Mean of $|\hat{D}_N^{(k)} - D|_F^2$ based on 50 replications

6 TESTING COVARIANCE STRUCTURE

We have been working with several nested covariance models: general covariance structure, diagonal covariance, and diagonal covariance with prescribed decay. A natural question arises how to choose the right submodel in a specific situation. While searching for a proper test, one must have in mind that we are dealing with high-dimensional matrices and small samples.

When two nested models are about to be compared and the likelihood function is available, the likelihood ratio test is the first choice. The statistic of this test has the form

$$\Lambda = \frac{\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta_0} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X})}{\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X})},$$

where $\Theta_0 \subset \Theta$ is the parameter space under the null hypothesis and $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbb{X})$ is the likelihood function based on a random sample $\mathbb{X}$. A classical result of Wilks (1938) says that under the null hypothesis the distribution of $-2\log(\Lambda)$ converges as $N \to \infty$ to a χ^2 distribution with the number of degrees of freedom equal to the difference in the dimensions of Θ and Θ_0. In the case of multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, D)$

$$L(D|\mathbb{X}) = ((2\pi)^n|D|)^{-N/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\boldsymbol{X}^{(k)}\right)^\top D^{-1}\boldsymbol{X}^{(k)}\right\}.$$

However, this test cannot be used when the sample size N is smaller than the dimension n, because in that case the sample covariance matrix becomes singular and the likelihood ratio test statistic is not well defined. When searching for a proper test, we must have a look separately at two hypotheses:

1. $H_0 : D$ is diagonal, $H_1 : D$ has general structure
2. $H_0' : D$ is diagonal with prescribed decay, $H_1' : D$ has general diagonal structure

First, have a look at the problem of testing the hypothesis H_0 vs. H_1, which is (for normal distribution) equivalent to the test of independence. As mentioned above, the likelihood ratio test is not applicable here because the test statistic becomes degenerate. Fortunately, several tests of diagonality have been developed recently by different authors in high-dimensional setting. Among these, we would like to mention papers Srivastava (2005), Cai and Tiefeng (2011) and Schott (2005), where diagonality tests are derived under the assumption of multivariate normality but under slightly different relationship between N and n.

In the case of testing the hypothesis H_0' vs. H_1', both matrices (that one associated with the model and that one associated with the submodel) are non-singular, so we can possibly use the classical likelihood ratio test described at the beginning of this section. However, this test is performed by using the χ^2 approximation, which relies on a theoretical assumption that the sample size N goes to infinity, while the parameter dimension n remains fixed. When the dimension n increases, the χ^2-convergence becomes slow and the LR test is seriously biased when the ratio n/N is not small enough. As a result, the true significance level of the test is much higher than the prescribed one. As far as we know, no corrected version of likelihood ratio test for this situation exists, which could be an interesting topic for further research.

7 CONCLUSIONS

The main aim of this work is to point out the significant advantage resulting from computing the MLE of the covariance matrix in a proper parameter subspace, especially in the high-dimensional

setting, when the available sample has small size relative to the dimension of the problem. This subspace can be formed, e.g., by a parametric model for covariance eigenvalues or for a diagonal matrix resulting from a suitable set of transformations.

We provide theoretical results on asymptotic comparison of covariance matrices of each estimator for multivariate normal distribution, where we can lean on the well-developed maximum likelihood theory. The situation for small samples is illustrated by a simulation. We consider two parametric models for the covariance eigenvalues based on the eigenvalues of Laplace operator. In practice, the proper model/subspace can be inferred from historical data.

Using a properly specified model, one can reach a significant improvement in performance, which can have a positive impact on the subsequent tasks like data assimilation and prediction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by the grant 13-34856S from the Czech Science Foundation (GACR).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ross N. Bannister. A review of forecast error covariance statistics in atmospheric variational data assimilation. II: Modelling the forecast error covariance statistics. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 134(637):1971–1996, 2008.

Jonathan D. Beezley, Jan Mandel, and Loren Cobb. Wavelet ensemble Kalman filters. In *Proceedings of IEEE IDAACS'2011, Prague, September 2011*, volume 2, pages 514–518. IEEE, 2011. doi: 10.1109/IDAACS.2011.6072819.

J. Berner, G. J. Shutts, M. Leutbecher, and T. N. Palmer. A spectral stochastic kinetic energy backscatter scheme and its impact on flow-dependent predictability in the ECMWF ensemble prediction system. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 66(3):603–626, 2009. doi: 10.1175/2008JAS2677.1.

Mark Buehner and Martin Charron. Spectral and spatial localization of background-error correlations for data assimilation. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 133(624): 615–630, 2007. doi: 10.1002/qj.50.

T. Tony Cai and Jiang Tiefeng. Limiting laws of coherence of random matrices with applications to testing covariance structure and construction of compressed sensing matrices. *Annals of Statistics*, 39(3):1496–1525, 2011. doi: 10.1214/11-AOS879.

Eric Carlen. Trace inequalities and quantum entropy: an introductory course. In *Entropy and the quantum*, volume 529 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 73–140. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010. doi: 10.1090/conm/529/10428.

Reinhard Furrer and Thomas Bengtsson. Estimation of high-dimensional prior and posterior covariance matrices in Kalman filter variants. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 98(2):227–255, 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.jmva.2006.08.003.

Gregory Gaspari, Stephen E. Cohn, Jing Guo, and Steven Pawson. Construction and application of covariance functions with variable length-fields. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 132(619):1815–1838, 2006. doi: 10.1256/qj.05.08.

Thomas M. Hamill and Chris Snyder. A hybrid ensemble Kalman filter–3D variational analysis scheme. *Monthly Weather Review*, 128(8):2905–2919, 2000. doi: 10.1175/1520-0493(2000)128<2905:AHEKFV>2.0.CO;2.

I. Kasanický, J. Mandel, and M. Vejmelka. Spectral diagonal ensemble Kalman filters. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 22(4):485 – 497, 2015. doi: 10.5194/npg-22-485-2015.

Hui Hsiung Kuo. *Gaussian measures in Banach spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 463. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975. doi: 10.1007/BFb0082008.

Olivier Ledoit and Michael Wolf. A well-conditioned estimator for large-dimensional covariance matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 88(2):365–411, 2004. doi: 10.1016/S0047-259X(03)00096-4.

E. L. Lehmann and George Casella. *Theory of point estimation*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998. doi: 10.1007/b98854.

Jan R. Magnus and Heinz Neudecker. *Matrix Differential Calculus with Applications in Statistics and Econometrics*. John Wiley, third edition, 2007.

Jan Mandel, Jonathan D. Beezley, and Volodymyr Y. Kondratenko. Fast Fourier transform ensemble Kalman filter with application to a coupled atmosphere-wildland fire model. In A. M. Gil-Lafuente and J. M. Merigo, editors, *Computational Intelligence in Business and Economics, Proceedings of MS'10*, pages 777–784. World Scientific, 2010. doi: 10.1142/9789814324441_0089.

Yann Michel and Thomas Auligné. Inhomogeneous Background Error Modeling and Estimation over Antarctica. *Monthly Weather Review*, 138(6):2229–2252, 2010. doi: 10.1175/2009mwr3139.1.

I. Mirouze and A. T. Weaver. Representation of correlation functions in variational assimilation using an implicit diffusion operator. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 136: 1421–1443, 2010. doi: 10.1002/qj.643.

R.J. Muirhead. *Aspects of Multivariate Statistical Theory*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2005. doi: 10.1002/9780470316559.

Olivier Pannekoucke, Loïk Berre, and Gerald Desroziers. Filtering properties of wavelets for local background-error correlations. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 133(623, Part B):363–379, 2007. doi: 10.1002/qj.33.

David F. Parrish and John C. Derber. The National Meteorological Center's spectral statistical-interpolation analysis system. *Monthly Weather Review*, 120(8):1747–1763, 1992. doi: 10.1175/1520-0493(1992)120<1747:TNMCSS>2.0.CO;2.

C. Radhakrishna Rao. *Linear statistical inference and its applications*. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, second edition, 1973. doi: 10.1002/9780470316436. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

Juliane Schäfer and Korbinian Strimmer. A shrinkage approach to large-scale covariance matrix estimation and implications for functional genomics. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 4:Article number 32, 2005. doi: 10.2202/1544-6115.1175.

James R. Schott. Testing for complete independence in high dimensions. *Biometrika*, 92(4):951–956, 2005. doi: 10.1093/biomet/92.4.951.

Daniel Simpson, Finn Lindgren, and Håvard Rue. Think continuous: Markovian gaussian models in spatial statistics. *Spatial Statistics*, 1:16–29, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.spasta.2012.02.003.

Muni S. Srivastava. Some tests concerning the covariance matrix in high dimensional data. *Journal of the Japan Statistical Society*, 35(2):251–272, 2005. doi: 10.14490/jjss.35.251.

Roman Vershynin. How close is the sample covariance matrix to the actual covariance matrix? *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 25(3):655–686, 2012. doi: 10.1007/s10959-010-0338-z.

Xuguang Wang, Dale M. Barker, Chris Snyder, and Thomas M. Hamill. A hybrid ETKF–3DVAR data assimilation scheme for the WRF model. Part I: Observing system simulation experiment. *Monthly Weather Review*, 136(12):5116–5131, 2008.

S. S. Wilks. The large-sample distribution of the likelihood ratio for testing composite hypotheses. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 9(1):60–62, 03 1938. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177732360.